

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 146 711

EA 010 135

AUTHOR Newby, Kenneth A.
TITLE Collective Bargaining--Practices and Attitudes of School Management. Research Report 1977-2.
INSTITUTION National School Boards Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 46p.
AVAILABLE FROM National School Boards Association, 1055 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20007 (\$3.50; quantity discounts)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrators Attitudes; *Board of Education Role; *Boards of Education; *Collective Bargaining; Community Involvement; Contracts; Elementary Secondary Education; Employer Employee Relationship; Negotiation Agreements; Principals; School Superintendents; *Surveys; Tables (Data); Teachers; Unions

ABSTRACT

This report contains the results of a survey of board of education members' and school administrators' attitudes toward collective bargaining. More than 1,600 board members and administrators were questioned at the 1976 National School Boards Association convention on all aspects of collective bargaining, including how school districts negotiate, the scope of bargaining, negotiators, time required to negotiate, impasses, and terms of contracts. The survey collected opinion on the impact and future of collective bargaining, as well as on the role of superintendents, principals, and the community in the bargaining process. The results indicate that collective bargaining is the primary management concern among school district administrators and board members. The survey also shows that there is great diversity in how bargaining is conducted in different parts of the country. (Author/DS)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *



National School Boards Association

RESEARCH REPORT

ED146711

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NSBA

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Research Report 1977-2

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING— Practices and Attitudes of School Management

KENNETH A. NEWBY, Atlanta University

EA 010 135



National School Boards Association

Will D. Davis, President
Harold V. Webb, Executive Director

Jeremiah Floyd, Assistant Executive Director, Institute Division
James A. Mecklenburger, Director of Research
Mary Ellen Sera, Research Assistant

Don E. Blom, Assistant Executive Director,
Administration and Membership Services Division
Lee VanBremen, Membership Services Director

Research Report 1977-2

Collective Bargaining—Practices and Attitudes of School Management

Price of Report: Single Copy \$3.50. Discounts on quantity orders:
10-49 copies, 10%; 50-99 copies, 15%; 100 or more copies, 20%. Shipping
and handling charges will be added to billed orders.

Reproduction: No part of this Research Report may be reproduced in any
form without prior written permission from the NSBA Membership Services Department.
Address communications to the Membership Services Director, National School
Boards Association, 1055 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.,
Washington, D.C. 20007.

Information reported in NSBA Research Reports does not necessarily
reflect official viewpoints of the Association.

Copyright © 1977 by National School Boards Association
All Rights Reserved.

Dr. Kenneth A. Newby is a professor of educational administration at Atlanta University. His work with this survey
and the cost of the data processing were supported by a grant from the Spencer Foundation administered
through Atlanta University.

CONTENTS

Foreword

The Status of Bargaining and the School Management View	1
Diversity	1
Concern and Distaste	1
Time	
Results	
Balance of Power	
Other Highlights from the Survey Results	3
Some Hard Questions Posed by the Survey Results	4
Who Should Bargain?	
What Should Be Bargained?	
Can Bargaining Be More Favorable?	
The Survey Data in Detail	7
How School Districts Negotiate	7
Scope of Bargaining	
Who Negotiates?	
Term of Contract	
Time Required to Negotiate	
Impasse	
Attitudes Toward Collective Bargaining	10
Impact of Bargaining	
Future of Bargaining	
Role of Administrators and the Community during Bargaining	13
Role of the Superintendent	
Perceived Role of the Superintendent	
Role of the Principal	
Perceived Role of the Principal	
Role of the Community	
Perceived Role of the Community	
Some Other Issues in Collective Bargaining.....	20
Bargaining Statutes	
Influential Political Actors	
What Are the Primary Management Concerns of School Managers? .	24
Footnotes	27
Appendices	29
A. Questionnaire	31
B. Research Methodology	35
C. Sample Composition	36

FOREWORD

We believe you will find this one of the most stimulating NSBA Research Reports you have received, for collective bargaining is now of more concern to most school board members than any other topic.

In the year since the survey reported here was conducted, these data have been discussed with many NSBA audiences. The data, and the provocative questions posed by the data, never fail to prompt spirited conversation. We trust this Report will generate the same kind of lively response, whether the reader agrees or disagrees with the data or its analysis.

Harold V. Webb, Executive Director
National School Boards Association

THE STATUS OF BARGAINING AND THE SCHOOL MANAGEMENT VIEW

This report discusses collective bargaining as it is practiced in the nation's school districts between school boards and teacher organizations. The Report also comments upon the attitudes of board members and chief administrators toward collective bargaining, drawing chiefly upon a survey of more than 1600 school board members and administrators conducted at the National School Boards Association's 1976 Convention.

These opening pages review the survey results in brief, and comment upon the significant questions this study poses for local school districts and for the leaders of school management and school board organizations. In the later portion of this Report, the data from the study are examined and explained in greater detail, and compared where appropriate to the professional literature on the subject.

Diversity

'Collective bargaining' is not a single process, as the singular noun suggests it might be. It is diverse. According to the survey, bargaining varies with respect to the number of board members involved and the degree of their involvement; board members are not involved directly in some districts, while in others they serve on the bargaining team or as chief negotiator. Similarly, bargaining varies with respect to involvement of superintendents, principals, attorneys and other actors. Bargaining varies with respect to length of contract, time devoted to bargaining, the need to resort to third-party intervention, and the subject matter or 'scope' of bargaining which ranges from very narrow to very broad.

Bargaining emerges from the survey as a dynamic process and, at the local school district level, an idiosyncratic one.

One is prompted by these data to ask whether the diverse nature of bargaining is a good thing or a problem. Does diversity reflect the decentralized nature of educational governance in America, demonstrating that local governance is preferable because it allows for each local school district to serve its local citizens? Or does diversity signal that bargaining is a process at once inefficient and uncontrolled, where school districts act without knowledge of the experience of other districts or the 'best' procedures as recommended by experts? This is but one of several questions raised, not answered, by the survey results.

Concern and distaste

Collective bargaining with teachers emerges as the most-often cited management concern in the nation's school districts. Bargaining was cited more often than even declining enrollment, cutting programs or cutting staff to balance budgets, discipline, public apathy, or curriculum reform. Moreover, board members' and superintendents' attitudes toward collective bargaining are far from favorable.

That a large majority of board members and administrators express distaste for collective bargaining is a major theme of the survey. The survey shows that bargaining is commonplace, practiced in 75% of districts nationwide (more than 80% except in the South). The survey shows that some, a minority, of management participants have neutral

or favorable views of bargaining. But many more participants have unfavorable views.

Why do so many representatives of management express unfavorable feelings toward bargaining? Three reasons emerge from the survey.

Time

One reason is time. The survey shows that more than half of districts sign one-year contracts, most of the rest two-year contracts. Less than one district in five manages to negotiate that contract in two months' time. Half require three to six months. Seven, eight, nine, ten months' time is not uncommon. The picture of boards and administrators giving the lion's share of each year to a one-year contract suggests how wearisome bargaining may become for some. If this is so, what can be done either to lengthen contracts, shorten negotiations, or both? Unfortunately, the survey does not reveal how some districts manage to complete bargaining in less than two months (nor whether they do it well), but it is an avenue worth exploring.

Results

A second reason for the expression of concern is based upon perceived results. Asked whether they agree or disagree with a variety of statements about bargaining, respondents gave these answers:

- Collective bargaining will force a disproportionate share of school funds into salaries and benefits: 88% agree.
- Collective bargaining will encourage the allocation of funds to those services which most benefit children: 88% disagree.
- Collective bargaining will increase the local tax burden on citizens: 87% agree.

Taking these expressions literally, school management says it does not favor a process which yields undesirable results. (It should be noted that there are some board members and administrators, twelve or thirteen percent in these examples, who disagree with the majority.)

Three observations suggest that the 'results' explanation can only be a partial reason for school management's distaste for collective bargaining.

First, while there are several unfavorable expressions, there are also three or four favorable expressions:

- Collective bargaining will cause board members to be better informed about school district operations: 65% agree.
- Collective bargaining will cause school boards to take a more aggressive role in planning, goal setting, priority setting, and the like: 78% agree.
- Collective bargaining will force school districts to adopt more effective management and budgeting practices: 63% agree.

And, believers in lay control of education may also think this a favorable expression:

- Collective bargaining will cause boards and teachers to decide matters (such as teacher promotion) which have traditionally been decided by administrators: 55% agree.

Second, an analysis of all the attitude expressions (See Table VII.) shows that unfavorable responses are more vehement among respondents from districts where bargaining does not take place. That is, those who have experience with bargaining are not as distressed by it as those who fear the prospect of bargaining but have yet to experience it. Similarly, favorable expressions are more frequent from those with experience than those without.

Third, expressions about the unfavorable results of bargaining may not have taken into account that these 'results' of bargaining, while unfavorable, could have causes other than bargaining. For example, salaries may rise disproportionately, or taxes rise, whether or not a district engages in bargaining.

Balance of power

A third reason for management's disfavor toward bargaining, the survey results suggest, is anxiety on management's part that management will be overpowered in bargaining.

The survey shows that respondents fear that the sides are not balanced in the bargaining process, that labor is stronger than management. Specifically, review the three statements under *Results*, above, which exemplify unfavorable feelings

toward collective bargaining. These are all expressions not only about the results of bargaining, but also expressions which imply that labor has more power than management and thus will prevail.

However, based on the favorable opinions cited earlier—that bargaining causes boards to become better informed, and more aggressive, in goal setting—one might conclude that some respondents believe that management can, or has, corrected the balance. Still one notes the unfavorable opinions are more widely and strongly held than the favorable ones.

One possible strategy for overcoming the perceived power of labor is to seek legislative relief. However, management may not be confident that it can get legislative relief. Most respondents say that at the state and national levels, teacher organizations are among the most powerful agencies that can impact upon legislation. Teacher organizations are cited more often than state boards of education or state superintendents, more often than the Federal courts or the U.S. Commissioner of Education. And teacher organizations are more often cited than respondents' own school board and administrator organizations.

In sum, the explanation for the distaste of boards and administrators toward collective bargaining is based in part on the time they devote, and in part that they dislike the results. A third explanation emerging from the survey is anxiety that, when boards bargain with teachers, teachers win and boards lose. No one likes an activity in which he thinks he will lose.

Other highlights from the survey results

The sample includes 1632 persons, 1390 board members and 242 administrators, mostly superintendents; the sample is a good cross-section of the Convention and a reasonably representative sample of board members and administrators nationwide except that school districts with fewer than 1000 students are under-represented at the Convention and thus in the sample.

Seventy-five percent of respondents are from dis-

tricts which bargain, 68% because they are from states which have bargaining laws, 7% because they choose to bargain even in the absence of a law.

Scope of bargaining. Respondents from districts which bargain were asked whether several items are covered in their districts' current contracts. Other than salary, which was not asked because salary is covered in virtually all contracts, the most frequent item covered in contracts is union dues deduction from salary (66%). Such items as teacher role in discipline, textbook selection, class size and teacher selection are covered in one-fifth to one-fourth of respondents' districts. Districts engaged in bargaining since before 1970 tend to have a broader scope of bargaining than those who began bargaining more recently, suggesting that the scope of bargaining broadens over time.

Composition of the negotiating team. Three-fourths (78%) of districts which bargain include board members on the team; the average number of board members is 2.5. Fifty-two percent include the superintendent. Fifty-four percent include central office administrators other than the superintendent; the average number of these is 1.7. One-third (34%) include principals; the average number is 1.8. Fewer than half include an outsider such as a negotiator or an attorney. The categories and number of persons who serve on negotiating teams seem to vary from district to district. So, too, with the chief negotiator. Twenty-two percent employ a professional for this purpose. Seventeen percent use a board member, and 14% the board president. Seventeen percent use a central office administrator and 15% use the superintendent. Attorneys, whether retained for this purpose (8%) or the regular school district attorney (5%) account for 13% of chief negotiators. Only 1% use a principal.

Term of contract; negotiation time; impasse. The average length of a contract is 1.6 years. Fifty-two percent are for one year, 33% for two, 12% for three. The average time required to negotiate is 5.25 months; that is, half of contracts require more than five months.

Of the 1204 respondents from districts that bargain, 520 or 43% report reaching an impasse during their last contract negotiation. Of them, half

experienced fact-finding, one-fifth experienced advisory arbitration, one in twenty experienced binding arbitration, and nearly one-fifth experienced strikes.

Future of bargaining. Asked whether bargaining will eventually reach every school district in the nation, 86% say yes. Of these, 12% believe this will occur within two years, 41% between two and five years, 26% from five to ten years, and 6% more than ten years.

Role of the superintendent. Asked their attitude, 17% say the superintendent should not be involved; 22% say he should sit at the table, 4% say as chief negotiator. This contrasts with actual practice where 52% use the superintendent on the team, 15% as chief negotiator. Thirteen percent would have the superintendent a neutral resource to both sides, while 43% would have the superintendent advise the board but not sit at the table.

Role of the principal. Asked their attitude, 32% say the principal should not be involved; 21% say a principal should sit at the table. In actual practice 34% use principals. Fourteen percent think principals should be neutral resources to both sides, while 31% would have principals advise the board only. Only 1% think principals should advise teachers but not the board, and no one thinks principals should be on the teachers' negotiating team.

Role of the community. The majority (61%) believe there should be no involvement for the public other than representation by the board. The remainder consider one or more kinds of public involvement: 15% would have the board hold hearings in advance; 23% would hold negotiation sessions open to the public and press; 8% would have the public at the table as a third party; and another 8% would have the final agreement subject to a public referendum.

Attitudes. Generally, board members and administrators express very similar attitudes. Those who have not bargained are more unfavorable toward bargaining than those who do; otherwise, other category breakdowns of the data (sex, region, type of district) show very few substantial differences.

Seventy-five percent believe that bargaining "will result in a better standard of living for teachers." Whether this is a favorable or an unfavorable expression is not clear.

Only 18% agree (82% disagree) that bargaining will result "in better public understanding of school district operations." Scarcely half (51%) agree that "citizen groups who 'lobby' both the board and teacher organizations" will spring up as a result of bargaining.

Most (83%) think that bargaining "will make teacher strikes more frequent" and even more (87%) say bargaining will "not prompt teacher organizations to be more responsive to the public's wishes."

Three-fourths (75%) say that bargaining "will cause reduction in the decision-making authority of school boards" and more (78%) say that bargaining "will tend to diminish the authority of school administrators over school affairs." The attitude about administrators is consistent, the attitude about boards inconsistent with the earlier response that bargaining causes boards and teachers to make decisions formerly made by administrators.

Some hard questions posed by the survey results

Having already acknowledged that diversity in composition of the negotiating team, scope of bargaining, or length of contract is open to dual interpretation (diversity is good; diversity is a problem), it is useful to probe these matters further.

Each school district, by whatever method, decides who shall serve on the negotiating team. Each district also decides, whether during bargaining or before, the scope of bargaining and the length of contract. How might districts be advised to do these well?

Who should bargain?

It is at first curious, perhaps perplexing, that what respondents think *ought* to be the composition of the team differs from what *is* the composition.

What does this portend? Perhaps, only dissatisfaction with the current contract, a belief that a different team would get a better contract.

But one might also interpret these results as a wish to reduce the role of administrators, whether superintendents or principals (the survey did not ask about central office) and thereby increase the presence of boards. If so, then collective bargaining is becoming, for many districts, an issue entangled in another crucial problem: the proper role of board and superintendent.

The response to the question about the role of the public is provocative because it touches on a vital issue not just related to bargaining. Sixty-one percent of survey respondents feel that there should be no involvement for the public in collective bargaining other than representation by the board. From one point of view, this suggests that boards may be insensitive to or disinterested in public involvement in school affairs. But this view is inconsistent with what we know about school boards, which in recent years have been encouraging citizen participation in policy making. Most districts have and favor citizen advisory committees, for example. (Also, one should note that while six respondents in ten prefer no additional public involvement, four in ten would consider more public involvement.)

It is likely that within the 61% are boards that, although they wish no new citizen involvement strategy, wish to be *more* responsive, *more* representative, *more* sensitive to public involvement, not less. This seems likely in light of boards' desires, just cited, to enhance *their* involvement rather than to enhance *staff* involvement.

What should be bargained?

The scope or subjects of bargaining vary; where districts have bargained for several years, the scope tends to be greater than in districts where bargaining began more recently.

Boards generally wish to keep the scope narrow. One survey question asked respondents to pretend they had the power to influence bargaining legislation; what *one* clause would they wish to assure in the legislation? Thirty-seven percent want to affect teacher strikes: 25% wish to outlaw

them, 1% to affirm teachers' right to strike, and 11% to require compulsory arbitration. But 61% feel that scope of bargaining is more crucial than strikes, with 6% wishing to establish a broad scope and 55% wishing to severely limit the scope.

Since most respondents do not feel favorable about bargaining, it is consistent that they would wish to limit the scope. So 55% may be evidence, again, merely of a distaste for bargaining.

But in light of the fact that scope tends to grow as bargaining persists and that teacher groups will press for broadening the scope, the position of the 6% who would establish a broad scope is interesting. For if it is true, as more than half of respondents say, that bargaining makes boards better informed, more aggressive, better managers, budgeters, and planners, and brings them more decision-making authority (at the expense of administrators) than before, might there be legitimacy in the argument that bargaining, with broad scope, properly handled, enhances the power and authority of school boards?

Can bargaining be more favorable?

In the attitudinal responses there are many strongly expressed unfavorable feelings about bargaining.

There are also the favorable expressions, fewer, and somewhat less vehement, which say that through bargaining, boards become better managers, planners, budgeters, goal setters, and priority setters.

A question, then, to coin a phrase, is how to accentuate the positive. Can ways be found to help boards and administrators to view the favorable more strongly than the unfavorable aspects of bargaining they see, so they don't enter the process at a psychological disadvantage? Can the bargaining process be changed, at the table, locally, or legislatively, to assure more favorable outcomes? Can services be offered by school boards associations or administrator associations that will facilitate favorable outcomes?

A more difficult question: Are there alternatives within what we call 'collective bargaining' that

would yield results more satisfactory to all parties, causing less anxiety and more advantage to management? There is suggestion that this is so, in the survey results, because of the persistent minority who do not hold the unfavorable opinions held by most of their peers. Who are these few yea-savers? The survey doesn't say. The sur-

vey does say that bargaining is not a singular phenomenon but a diverse one; that it is conducted not one way but many ways. Apparently, some of these ways are seen by some board members and administrators as neutral or advantageous.

THE SURVEY DATA IN DETAIL

How school districts negotiate

As discussed in the previous chapter, a study about collective bargaining was conducted at the 1976 NSBA Convention.¹ It reveals that collective bargaining practices are diverse, not uniform, among the 75% of local school districts which periodically engage in bargaining with a teacher union or organization.

This is true with respect to scope of bargaining, the term of contracts, the time required to negotiate, impasse procedures needed, and other matters.

Scope of bargaining

In the professional and scholarly literature on bargaining, there is substantial disagreement about what is and what should be bargained.

From a management perspective, it is often argued that there is only a narrow group of topics appropriate to bargaining. Certain rights and powers of the board and superintendent should not be shared with teachers under any circumstances, it is said. On the other hand, teacher leaders act, generally, as if anything that pertains to the professional lives of teachers is or should be negotiable. This disagreement was graphically displayed in an earlier NSBA Research Report² which showed that in twenty-eight districts, board members believe in a narrow scope of bargaining while teacher leaders believe all issues should be bargained. That report showed an analysis of the contracts in those twenty-eight cities, revealing that the actual scope of bargaining is much broader than board members prefer.

The American Association of School Administrators (AASA) recently addressed scope of bargaining as it drafted a model law for collective bargaining. The model proposes that, insofar as possible, the scope of bargaining should be confined to wages and related economic matters, as well as grievance and negotiations procedures, preferably on specific enumerated topics. AASA admits that any attempt to narrow the scope of bargaining will inevitably generate union opposition, but AASA says that it is better to make an all out effort to overcome this opposition at the legislative level than to be confronted by endless bargaining on a host of inappropriate subjects.¹

In order to characterize scope of bargaining, the survey at the NSBA Convention asked:

Which of the following items are covered by your district's current contract with teachers?

Table I shows that a wide variety of items is covered by some contracts. Salary was not included in the list of items given because it was assumed that salary would be covered in most or all contracts. Excluding salary, the three most frequently contracted items are union dues deduction from salary (66%), teacher evaluation procedures (54%), and maximum teacher work load (51%). Teacher transfer procedures (49%) and teacher promotion procedures (41%) ranked high. A much smaller but scarcely insignificant proportion of school districts include assignment of teacher aides (21%), teacher selection procedures (19%) and textbook selection procedures (16%).

Even though some items seem to be covered in many contracts, it should be noted that none is cited for *all* contracts and many items are cited in relatively few contracts. Likely, some of these will change in the future, since teacher groups will

Table I*Items covered in current teachers' contract*

	Covered %	Not Covered %	Do Not Know %	No Response %
Union dues deduction from salary	66	28	4	2
Teacher evaluation procedures	54	43	2	1
Maximum teacher work load	51	45	3	1
Teacher transfer procedures	49	42	4	4
Teacher promotion procedures	41	52	4	3
Curriculum planning procedures	28	64	5	3
Maximum class size	27	70	2	1
Teacher role in disciplining students	26	66	5	3
Assignment of teacher aides	21	72	4	3
Teacher selection procedures	19	73	5	4
Textbook selection procedures	16	76	4	4

The total number of respondents for this question is 1204.

continue to press for broader scope of bargaining. For example, Frank Masters of The National Education Association says that clauses dealing with job security will appear increasingly as bargaining becomes more sophisticated.⁴

In an analysis of these data by region of the country, responses from the East and Midwest—where bargaining has occurred longest—show more items bargained than responses from the West and South.

Who negotiates?

Whether board members should or should not serve on the bargaining team; whether superintendents should serve; whether outside negotiators should be hired—these and related questions are often debated and advised about in the literature and in training sessions about collective bargaining. Accordingly, the question was asked:

During the last time your school district negotiated a contract with teachers, who served on your district's negotiating team? Who served as your school district's chief negotiator?

The results are reported in Table II.

More than three-fourths (78%) of those whose districts had bargained say that at least one board member served on the negotiating team. Twenty-five percent report one board member on the team, 33% report two, 27% report three, and 14% report four or more. The average is 2.5 in these districts.

More than half (54%) report that at least one central office administrator other than the superintendent was a member of the negotiating team. Of these, 55% report one, 27% report two, and 18% report three or more. The average is 1.7 in these districts.

More than half (52%) say that the superintendent was a member of the team.

Slightly more than one-third (36%) included at least one principal as a member of the team. Of these, 45% report one, 38% report two, and 16% report three or more. The average is 1.8 in these districts.

A smaller number included the board president (32%). One-fourth (25%) of respondents say they used a professional negotiator retained for this purpose, but fewer school districts used the services of the regular school district attorney (12%) or an attorney retained for this purpose (11%).

Table II*Composition of the negotiating team*

	<i>Member of the Team</i> %	<i>Chief Negotiator</i> %
Board President	32	14
Board Member (at least one)	78	17
Superintendent	52	15
Professional Negotiator Retained for this Purpose	25	22
Regular School District Attorney	12	5
Attorney Retained for this Purpose	11	8
Central Office Administrator other than the Superintendent (at least one)	54	17
Principals (at least one)	36	1
Other	6	2

The total number of respondents for these questions is 1204.

Since the responses in Table II total 300%, it can be assumed that the average bargaining team has at least three types of members. It seems that teams are most likely to include one to three board members, one to three administrators or principals or the superintendent, and in half or less of districts, one outsider.

In responding to the question concerning who served as the chief negotiator, the greatest number, but only one-fifth (22%) of respondents say that they retained a professional negotiator. A somewhat smaller number (17%) used either a board member or a central office administrator other than the superintendent. The superintendent served as the chief negotiator in 15% of the cases, while the board president served as the chief negotiator in 14%. Attorneys, whether retained for this purpose (8%) or the regular school district attorney (5%) accounted for 13% of chief negotiators. Although one-third of respondents report having a principal on the bargaining team, very few (1%) used a principal as chief negotiator.

Term of contract

How often a board negotiates is a function of how long the term of each contract is. To determine how often boards engage in bargaining, the question was asked:

How many years does your current contract cover?

Based upon the findings reported in Table III, one can see a considerable variation in the number of years that contracts cover. More than half (52%) of the contracts, however, cover a period of only one year. Another third (33%) cover two years. Only one in eight covers a period of three years or more (12%). In short, most contracts (85%) cover a period of one or two years. The average of these, excluding 'other,' is 1.6 years.

Time required to negotiate

The energy which school districts devote to bargaining can be characterized not only by the fre-

Table III*Years of a contract*

	%
One year	52
Two years	33
Three years	12
Other	3

The total number of respondents for this question is 1204.

quency of bargaining, but the length of time required to negotiate each contract. Accordingly, the NSBA Convention survey asked:

The last time your district negotiated a contract with teachers, how many months elapsed from the start of negotiations until the signing of the contract?

As shown in Table IV, the number of months elapsed from the start of negotiations until the signing of the contract also varies among school districts. It ranges from as little as one month to more than thirteen. More than half of respondents state that they spent five or more months in negotiations. The average is 5.25 months. Even though administrators and board members dislike the bargaining process (as is reported at length in Table VI), they typically spend three to six months or more in bargaining—as often as not for a one-year contract.

Impasse

Associated with collective bargaining is the realm of activities including fact-finding, arbitration, and strikes. To learn how often these things occur, the Convention survey asked:

Table IV

Months elapsed during negotiations

Months	%
1	6
2	12
3	14
4	15
5	9
6	14
7	5
8	6
9	5
10	4
11	2
12	1
13 or more	3
No response	3

The total number of respondents for this question is 1204.

The last time your district negotiated a contract with teachers, which of the following experiences did your district have? Check all appropriate items.

The results are reported in Table V.

Slightly more than half of the respondents (54%) state that their district did not reach an impasse during negotiations. Of those 520 who did reach an impasse, half experienced fact-finding, nearly one-fifth experienced advisory arbitration, one in twenty experienced binding arbitration, and nearly one-fifth experienced a strike.

The pattern of diversity, shown in scope of bargaining, members of the team, length of contract, time spent bargaining, and impasse experience, is reflected in people's attitudes toward bargaining, also.

Attitudes toward collective bargaining

Impact of bargaining

Not all people respond to collective bargaining in the same manner. To gather attitudinal information, respondents were asked fifteen questions about their assessment of the impact, over the next few years, of collective bargaining—on their own district, or other districts. To each question, respondents checked one of four responses:

Table V

Impasse experiences

	%
Did not reach an impasse	54
Mediation	33
Fact-finding	23
Advisory arbitration	8
Binding arbitration	3
Strike	7
Other	5
No response	3

The total number of respondents for this question is 1204.

I agree; I tend to agree; I tend to disagree; or I disagree. For purpose of analysis, responses were given this weighting:

I agree	+2
I tend to agree	+1
I tend to disagree	-1
I disagree	-2

Then the average response to each item was calculated. (So, for example, responses averaging 1.3 indicate a very strong agreement, while .8 or .4 indicate less strong agreement. Similarly, -1.2 indicates strong disagreement.)

The proportion of positive and negative responses, and the average of responses, are reported along with the fifteen questions in Table VI.

The findings reflect diverse feelings about collective bargaining; no item received total positive or negative response. Still, most board members and administrators find more to fault than to praise. It should be noted that they do find some benefit to bargaining, especially as it affects budgeting, management, the nature of decisions made by the board, the aggressiveness of the board, and the behavior of certain community groups.

Impact of collective bargaining upon the traditional authority of school boards. Although three out of four respondents agree that bargaining will reduce the decision-making authority of school administrators (.9) and of boards (.8), more than half say that bargaining will cause boards and teachers to decide matters which have traditionally been decided by administrators (.1). Two-thirds of respondents believe bargaining will cause board members to become better informed about school district operations (.4), while three-fourths agree that bargaining will cause boards to take a more aggressive role in planning, goal setting, priority setting, and the like (.9).

Impact of collective bargaining upon children. Most respondents (88%) disagree that bargaining will encourage the allocation of funds to those services which most benefit children (-1.2), while the same proportion agree that bargaining will force a disproportionate share of funds into teacher salaries and benefits (1.3).

Impact of collective bargaining upon teachers and the public. Three-fourths of respondents agree

that bargaining will result in a better standard of living for teachers (.8) and even more believe that bargaining will increase the local tax burden on citizens (1.3). Respondents agree strongly that bargaining will make teacher strikes more frequent than if there were no bargaining at all (1.2). Most respondents do not believe that bargaining will prompt teacher organizations to be more responsive to the public's wishes (-1.2). Few expect that bargaining will result in better public understanding of school district operations (-1.1) but half at least tend to agree that bargaining will prompt growth of citizen groups who "lobby" both the board and teacher organizations for the benefit of children (0.0).

In sum, the attitude responses are sometimes positive, sometimes negative, and often inconsistent—for example, believing that the decision-making authority of the board will be reduced but that boards will become more aggressive in planning, goal setting and priority setting. Respondents generally concur that the public will be no better informed, will pay higher taxes, will suffer more teacher strikes, and will not find teacher organizations more responsive; but they often expect that citizen groups will lobby both sides of bargaining table.

It should be noted that changes in management and governance at the district level may occur simultaneously with—and might be negated by—another change. More than half of respondents believe that bargaining by each school district will be replaced by bargaining at the regional or state level (.1).

The responses can be divided into categories for further analysis: board member, administrator; male, female; years the district has bargained with teachers; region of the country; type of school district; and roles played by respondents during bargaining.

Table VII reports these variables. Few of them vary substantially from the total response.

Administrators and board members show substantially the same attitudes toward bargaining; administrators are slightly more vehement in their views. Men and women also have substantially the same views.

Table VI

Attitudes toward collective bargaining

	Average	Agree %	Disagree %
Collective bargaining will encourage the allocation of funds to those services which most benefit children.	-1.2	12	88
Collective bargaining will result in a better standard of living for teachers.	.8	75	25
Collective bargaining will result in better public understanding of school district operation.	-1.1	18	82
Collective bargaining will cause boards and teachers to decide matters (such as teacher promotion) which have traditionally been decided by administrators.	.1	55	45
Collective bargaining will force school districts to adopt more effective management and budgeting practices.	.4	63	37
Collective bargaining will promote growth of citizen groups who 'lobby' both the board and teacher organizations for the benefit of children.	0.0	51	49
Collective bargaining will cause board members to be better informed about school district operations.	.4	65	35
Collective bargaining will cause reduction in the decision-making authority of school boards.	.8	75	25
Collective bargaining will tend to diminish the authority of school administrators over school affairs.	.9	78	22
Collective bargaining will increase the local tax burden on citizens.	1.3	87	13
Collective bargaining will cause school boards to take a more aggressive role in planning, goal setting, priority setting, and the like.	.9	78	22
Collective bargaining will prompt teacher organizations to be more responsive to the public's wishes.	-1.2	13	87
Collective bargaining by each school district will be replaced by bargaining at the regional or state level.	.1	57	43
Collective bargaining will make teacher strikes more frequent than if there were no bargaining at all.	1.2	83	17
Collective bargaining will force a disproportionate share of school funds into salaries and benefits.	1.3	88	12

The total number of respondents for this question is 1496.

Those from districts which do not bargain are more negative in their attitudes about bargaining than those from districts which do bargain. Whether the district began bargaining prior to 1970 or more recently makes little difference on most items; those who have been bargaining since before 1970 are more likely to believe that bargaining leads to a better standard of living for teachers.

Board members and administrators from districts that bargain are more likely to believe that bargaining leads to more effective management and budgeting, to a better informed school board, and to a more aggressive school board. Similarly, those who bargain are less likely to believe that bargaining diminishes board or administrator authority or that strikes occur more frequently due to bargaining.

The same pattern occurs by region. Attitudes in the South and West are more negative than in the East and Midwest; presumably this is because bargaining occurs less frequently in the South and West.

That bargaining leads to more aggressive boards seems more persuasive to rural, small town, and suburban boards than to urban boards. That bargaining leads to a better standard of living for teachers seems more persuasive to suburban and urban boards than to rural and small town boards. Otherwise, there are no substantial differences between rural, small town, suburban and urban responses.

Chief negotiators are somewhat less likely than others to agree that bargaining leads to better public understanding; they are less likely, also, to believe that teacher organizations will become more responsive to public wishes. Otherwise, all persons who have served on bargaining teams (whether or not as negotiator) have substantially the same views. People who have not served on a bargaining team are less likely than others to believe that bargaining leads to a better informed board. Otherwise, the views of those who have served on bargaining teams and those who have not do not vary substantially.

Future of bargaining

Because bargaining continues to grow as a practice, from no bargaining in 1960 to 75% of districts in 1976, the Convention survey asked:

Today, some form of collective bargaining with teachers occurs in the majority of school districts. In your judgment, will collective bargaining become standard practice within all school districts in the nation?

The responses are reported in Table VIII.

The findings indicate that more than half (53%) of respondents believe that collective bargaining will become a standard practice in all school districts within the next five years. More than three-fourths (79%) believe that it will become a standard practice within all school districts within the next ten years. At least 85% believe that it will become a standard practice sometime in the future. However, almost 15% of respondents believe that collective bargaining will never become a standard

practice within all school districts. Presumably, these respondents discount the possibility of a federal collective bargaining law.

Role of administrators and the community during bargaining

Another question that confronts school managers in collective bargaining is: What should be the role of the superintendent, principal and community during negotiations? Not only the findings of this study but also a review of what some authorities are suggesting show that this question is controversial and the actual practice is very diverse.

Role of the superintendent

What should be the role of the superintendent during negotiations? Uninvolved? Chief negotiator? Or somewhere between these two extremes? What role can he play most effectively—passive observer or active participant? How has bargaining affected his authority and power? How can he best protect his authority and power? According to Emery Stoops, Max Rafferty and Russell Johnson, collective bargaining has curtailed the amount of professional influence wielded by the superintendent rather than increased it.⁵ This is reflected by the attitude responses, cited earlier, where 75% believe that bargaining reduces the authority of administrators.

In 1968, The American Association of School Administrators decided that the superintendent should play a significant role in negotiations, his basic obligation being to the welfare of children and to provide leadership in the formulation of sound educational policy. At that time, AASA believed that the superintendent should be an independent third party in the negotiations process. AASA said that the superintendent should review all proposals in light of their effect upon students and work closely with both the board and the teacher representatives to reach an agreement which would be in the best interest of the educational program. Even though in larger school districts he might delegate the role of formal negotiations to an associate superintendent, in no instances should such a responsibility be delegated to a person outside the profession.⁶

Table VII

Attitudes toward collective bargaining by category of respondent

	Position in District			Bargaining Law					Region				Type of District				Only Those Who Bargain			
	TOTAL	Board Mem-ber	Adminis-trator	Male	Fe-male	Before 1970	After 1970	No Law	East	Mid-west	South	West	Rural	Small Town	Sub-urban	Ur-ban	Chief Negotiator	Mem-ber of Team	Not on Team	None of Above
Collective bargaining will encourage the allocation of funds to those services which most benefit children.	-1.2	-1.2	-1.4	-1.2	-1.2	-1.1	-1.2	-1.4	-1.1	-1.2	-1.4	-1.4	-1.2	-1.2	-1.3	-1.2	-1.5	-1.1	-1.1	-1.3
Collective bargaining will result in a better standard of living for teachers.	.8	.8	.9	.7	1.0	1.2	.8	.5	1.2	.8	.3	.6	.6	.7	1.0	1.0	.9	1.0	.9	.8
Collective bargaining will result in better public understanding of school district operation.	-1.1	-1.0	-1.2	-1.1	-1.1	-1.1	-1.0	-1.2	-1.0	-1.1	-1.2	-1.1	-1.1	-1.1	-1.1	-1.0	-1.3	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0
Collective bargaining will cause boards and teachers to decide matters (such as teacher promotion) which have traditionally been decided by administrators.	.1	.1	.2	0.0	.3	.2	.1	0.0	.1	.1	.1	.2	0.0	.1	.1	.1	-.1	0.0	.2	.2
Collective bargaining will force school districts to adopt more effective management and budgeting practices.	.4	.4	.4	.5	.2	.6	.6	.1	.7	.5	0.0	.3	.5	.4	.4	.4	.7	.6	.5	.6
Collective bargaining will promote growth of citizen groups who 'lobby' both the board and teacher organizations for the benefit of children.	0.0	-.1	.1	0.0	-.2	.1	0.0	-.2	.1	-.1	-.2	0.0	0.0	-.1	0.0	0.0	-.1	.1	0.0	-.1
Collective bargaining will cause board members to be better informed about school district operations.	.4	.4	.5	.4	.4	.7	.6	.1	.6	.5	0.0	.5	.5	.4	.5	.3	.7	.7	.4	.5

Collective bargaining will cause reduction in the decision-making authority of school boards.

.8 .8 1.1 .8 1.0 .8 .8 1.0 .6 .9 .9 .9 .8 .9 .9 .8 .9 .7 .9 .6

Collective bargaining will tend to diminish the authority of school administrators over school affairs

.9 .9 1.2 .9 1.0 .8 .9 1.1 .7 1.0 1.1 1.0 .9 .9 .9 .9 .9 .8 1.0 .7

Collective bargaining will increase the local tax burden on citizens.

1.3 1.3 1.4 1.4 1.2 1.4 1.3 1.3 1.5 1.3 1.4 1.2 1.2 1.4 1.4 1.2 1.2 1.4 1.3 1.3

Collective bargaining will cause school boards to take a more aggressive role in planning, goal setting, priority setting, and the like.

.9 .9 .9 .9 .9 1.1 1.0 .6 1.0 .9 .5 .9 1.1 .9 .9 .6 1.0 1.1 .9 1.1

Collective bargaining will prompt teacher organizations to be more responsive to the public's wishes.

-1.2 -1.2 -1.3 -1.2 -1.1 -1.2 -1.1 -1.3 -1.1 -1.7 -1.3 -1.2 -1.2 -1.1 -1.3 -1.2 -1.3 -1.1 -1.2 -1.1

Collective bargaining by each school district will be replaced by bargaining at the regional or state level.

.1 .1 .1 .1 .1 .2 .1 .3 .1 .1 .1 .1 .2 .1 .1 .2 0.0 .1 .1 -.2

Collective bargaining will make teacher strikes more frequent than if there were no bargaining at all.

1.2 1.1 1.3 1.2 1.0 1.0 1.1 1.3 1.0 1.2 1.4 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.0 1.1 .9

Collective bargaining will force a disproportionate share of school funds into salaries and benefits.

1.3 1.3 1.4 1.3 1.3 1.2 1.3 1.4 1.3 1.3 1.4 1.2 1.2 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.2 1.3 1.2

All figures represent average response to each item by category of respondent.

Table VIII

Collective bargaining as a future practice

	%
Yes, in less than two years	12
Yes, within two - five years	41
Yes, within five - ten years	26
Yes, but in more than ten years	6
No, some school districts will never engage in bargaining.	14

The total number of respondents for this question is 1496.

Somewhat differently, The National School Boards Association's Educational Policies Service noted that in some instances it might be wise to use professional negotiators as members of the team even though extreme care should be taken in their selection.⁷

In a speech at the 1976 NSBA Convention, Larry Lundberg stated that the superintendent should avoid being the spokesman for the board's negotiating team and, in most instances, he should not be a member of the team. Lundberg said that the superintendent could be more effective by delegating negotiations to someone else for the following reasons:

1. The superintendent does not have time to be directly involved.
2. The superintendent's status can be damaged by bargaining directly with teachers.
3. The superintendent can alienate the instructional staff, thus undermining his leadership role.⁸

In a like manner, William P. Smith offered the following reasons for keeping superintendents away from the bargaining table:

1. The presence of the superintendent often inhibits the frankness and candor of discussion.
2. The superintendent is often psychologically unsuited for effective participation.
3. The superintendent cannot afford to injure his day to day, long-range leadership role by being a participant in the controversial and adversary battles over the table.
4. The absence of the superintendent at the table prevents the teachers from direct access to the one that has ultimate authority and power on matters that should not be negotiated.
5. The role of the other members on the management negotiating team is enhanced by his absence.

6. The presence of the superintendent lessens the importance of the chief negotiator.

7. Without the superintendent at the table many districts have to use a principal as a part of the team. This is important because the negotiated agreement affects the principal more than any other administrator.

8. Since the superintendent is the highest paid employee in the district, his presence at the table would result in an inordinate expenditure in time and money.

9. The superintendent's presence at the table gives recognition to the negotiating process that is more important than it deserves.

10. All those at the bargaining table are relative equals and the superintendent inevitably loses some of his authority while at the table.

11. By not being at the table, the superintendent can avoid the stigma of direct responsibility for big problems that sometimes arise.

12. The physical well being of the superintendent is literally threatened by the superintendent's participation at the table.

13. The argument and direct confrontation of teachers versus superintendent is counter productive to successful negotiations.

14. By not being at the table, the superintendent does not necessarily relinquish his leadership role in negotiations. Still, he must participate in management team caucuses, be the person making effective recommendations as to management's position, and direct the data gathering and back-up procedures that support the negotiating team.⁹

Instead of using the superintendent at the table, Lundberg recommends using other upper echelon personnel or a professional negotiator.

A study by Robert L. Eastman suggests that while the superintendent has not been an active participant in negotiations in most instances, he has been very closely involved behind the scenes. All indications are that the superintendent has not been "by-passed" even when a chief negotiator has been hired.¹⁰

Much of the literature drifts toward the suggestion that the superintendent should advise and consult the board but should not be an active participant at the table.

Perceived role of the superintendent

In order to assess what board members and administrators believe the role of the superintendent should be in negotiations, the Convention survey asked:

In your judgment, what should be the role of the superintendent in collective bargaining?

The results are presented in Table IX.

Board members and central office administrators are divided on the role of the superintendent during negotiations. While more than two-fifths (43%) of respondents think that the superintendent should support and advise the board but not sit at the table, other respondents hold many views about what the superintendent's role should be. For all practical purposes, respondents are just about evenly divided as to whether

the superintendent should not be involved (17%), should be neutral, an information resource to both sides, supporting neither (13%), or should sit at the table on the board's negotiating team (22%). Only 4% say the superintendent should be the board's chief negotiator.

While 26% think the superintendent should be a member of the team or its chief negotiator, the survey shows that among districts that negotiate, half (52%) had the superintendent on the negotiating team and 15% had the superintendent serving as chief negotiator.

Role of the principal

As was noted in the January, 1976, issue of *The American School Board Journal*, many principals are dissatisfied with the superintendent and school board, particularly over the manner in which they bargain with teachers.¹¹ Two other authors, Clifford Edwards and Keith Burnett, phrased it accordingly:

The recent trend toward increased negotiation in education has produced a number of critical problems demanding solutions. One of these is defining the principal's role in negotiation. Generally speaking, this role has not been defined. Principals, thus, find themselves on the fence, coming under the fire of teacher groups as well as boards of education.¹²

Table IX

Perceived role of the superintendent

	%
The superintendent should not be involved in the process.	17
The superintendent should be neutral, an information resource to both sides, supporting neither.	13
The superintendent should support and advise the board, but not sit at the table.	43
The superintendent should sit at the table as a member of the board's negotiating team.	22
The superintendent should be the board's chief negotiator.	4
Other roles for superintendent	1

The total number of respondents for this question is 1565.

Other writers have described the tenuous position of the principal by stating that the principal is a man caught in the middle. On one hand, he is supposed to speak for his teachers, pupils and neighborhood. On the other hand, he is supposed to represent the school board and central administration by enforcing their policies.

What about this tenuous, uncertain and ambiguous position of the principal? Is it desirable?

The literature offers three points of view about the role of the principal during bargaining: that the principal should not choose sides and remain neutral; that he should serve as a member of the management team; that principals not be a member of the management team. Also, some experts are counseling, principals may need to have their own bargaining unit.

Perceived role of the principal

In order to assess attitudes of school board members and administrators toward the role of the principal in bargaining, the question was posed:

In your judgment, what should be the role of a principal during collective bargaining?

The results are reported in Table X.

The distribution of responses indicates that school board members and administrators are more divided about the role of the principal during negotiations than they are about the role of the superintendent. Respondents are almost evenly divided as to whether the principal should not be involved (32%), should support and advise the

board but not sit at the table (31%), or should be a member of the board's bargaining team (21%).

Slightly more than one-sixth (14%) believe that the principal should be neutral, an information resource to both sides, supporting neither. Few respondents agree that a principal should support and advise teachers or that a principal should be a member of the teachers' bargaining team.

Unlike the responses about superintendents, responses about principals are consistent with actual practice, where 36% report involvement of principals on the bargaining team.

In sum, while there is uncertainty about the role principals should play during bargaining, most respondents think the principal should be a member of the management team if involved in bargaining at all.

Role of the community

What is the role of the community in bargaining? John Leddy, a professional negotiator, contends that public participation in negotiations will not work.¹³ But as one parent in a major city stated last year, "It may be the teacher union leaders and school managers who agree on the terms of the new contracts, but it is my tax dollars which will finance it."¹⁴

As taxpayers, parents and others are not only concerned that they have to finance the agreed upon contract, but many also believe that they can contribute constructively to the negotiated agreement.

Table X

Perceived role of the principal

	%
A principal should not be involved in the process.	32
A principal should be neutral, an information resource to both sides, supporting neither.	14
A principal should support and advise the board, but not sit at the table.	31
A principal should support and advise teachers on the bargaining position.	1
A principal should be a member of the board's negotiating team.	21
A principal should be a member of the teacher's negotiating team.	0

The total number of respondents for this question is 1632.

Several individuals and groups across the country have begun a campaign whose aim is to give the community a role at the bargaining table.

The Institute for Responsive Education (IRE) is one group which has considered widening the scope of bargaining to include community participation.

Another group which has expressed similar concern in this area is The National Committee for Citizens in Education. NCCE has stated that the major loser in collective bargaining has been the public, since in most instances private citizens are excluded by law from participating.¹⁵

In an effort to minimize this problem, Don Davies, director of IRE, has proposed five models for assuring that the diverse interests of students, parents and community are better represented:

1. The responsive board—The approach requires a board to communicate specific information about issues to its constituency prior to formal negotiations, and to seek advice from its constituency.

2. Multilevel bargaining—In this approach, the central board and teachers negotiate a master contract covering city-wide issues such as salaries and fringe benefits. Decentralized supplementary bargaining follows and includes those matters which are more germane to a specific area or school.

3. The independent "third force"—Allowing for a number of variations, this three-way model of bargaining might encourage community representatives as mediators. Or these representatives might serve as a third party at the bargaining table, with their own demands and the right to approve any final agreement.

4. The ombudsman—The ombudsman's mandate is to protect the public interest, placing highest priority on the interest of students.

5. Limited-scope bargaining—This approach would greatly limit the scope of bargaining, keeping off limit as many educationally significant issues as possible. Large areas of policy and practice would therefore still be open to parents and students through some mechanism other than bargaining.¹⁶

Recently there has been an intensified effort toward revolutionizing collective bargaining practices through so-called sunshine laws which cause at least a portion of the bargaining process to be open to public scrutiny. Florida has such a law.

Donald Magruder, executive director of The Florida School Boards Association, contends that there are at least three advantages to the sunshine law: 1) The sunshine laws can create public pressure that forces teacher unions to temper their demands; 2) the laws can engender public support for property acquisitions and building-site selections; and 3) they can elicit sophisticated community assistance for school financial matters. Open meetings give school boards an opportunity to let the entire community know what the financial situation is.¹⁷

A survey conducted by The Florida School Boards Association slightly over a year ago indicates that 68% of all board members and 64% of all superintendents prefer bargaining in the open to bargaining behind closed doors. However, a majority of the chief negotiators prefer at least some closed bargaining sessions. Some negotiators point out that sunshine bargaining tends to polarize positions and makes it difficult for both sides to openly express options and alternate solutions. However, public sessions can work to management's advantage because public opinion is generally opposed to union demands and the union therefore is placed on the defensive.¹⁸

One Florida school board member, Holmes Braddock, a member of Miami's Dade County Board, expresses an unfavorable view to bargaining "in the open," complaining that as a result of sunshine law, board members cannot even talk among themselves. Furthermore, Braddock continues, the sunshine law has not toned down any union demands in Dade County.¹⁹

Perceived role of the community

To assess attitudes of school board members and superintendents toward the role of the community during negotiations, the question was asked:

In what ways, if any, do you think the public should be involved in the collective bargaining process?

The results are reported in Table XI.

Table XI*Perceived role of the community*

	%
No involvement; the board is the public's representative.	61
Board should hold hearings in advance of the bargaining process.	15
Negotiation sessions should be open to the press and public scrutiny.	23
Representatives of citizen groups should be third parties at the table.	8
Final agreement should be subject to public referendum.	8
Other roles for community	3

The total number of respondents for this question is 1632.

Only a minority of districts seem willing to alter collective bargaining to admit new public access. Data in Table XI reveal heavy agreement (61%) that there should be no involvement of the community in negotiations beyond the board's acting as the public's representative. The next highest percentage of respondents believes that negotiation sessions should be open to the press and public scrutiny (23%) and the third highest percentage of respondents thinks that the board should hold hearings in advance of the bargaining process (15%). Only a few respondents think either that representatives of citizen groups should be third parties at the table (8%) or that the final agreement should be subject to public referendum (8%).

Some other issues in collective bargaining

Bargaining statutes

Since there is considerable dissatisfaction with the collective bargaining process and thus with many

of the current collective bargaining statutes; and since some states are now in the process of formulating a statute, this study asked what changes board members and administrators would like to see in a revised collective bargaining law.

The question also serves as a clue to the aspects of bargaining which boards and administrators most dislike and would like to see changed:

Suppose that a collective bargaining law was being written or rewritten in your state today, and you (personally) had an opportunity to assure one provision of that law, which one of the following would be your highest priority in a bargaining law?

The results are shown in Table XII.

As indicated by the data in Table XII, more than half of respondents (55%) emphasize their desire to limit the scope of bargaining to finance items. One-fourth of respondents would choose to outlaw the right of teachers to strike. Roughly one-tenth (11%) of respondents desire compulsory arbitration instead of strikes. Only a few (6%) would

Table XII*Rewriting a collective bargaining law*

	%
Limiting the scope of bargaining to finance items (e.g., wages, hours)	55
Establishing a broad scope of items that are subject to bargaining	6
Outlawing the right of teachers to strike	25
Affirming the right of teachers to strike	1
Compulsory arbitration instead of a strike	11
Other	2

The total number of respondents for this question is 1526.

Table XIII*Educational influences at the state level*

	%
State Teacher Organization	88
State School Boards Association	61
State Board of Education	36
State and Federal Courts	33
State Superintendent of Education	30
State Administrator Association	17
State PTA	9
Other	4

The total number of respondents for this question is 1632.

like a law to establish a broad scope of items that are subject to bargaining. Virtually no one (1%) strongly desires to affirm the right of teachers to strike.

Influential political actors

Where policy differences exist, as over collective bargaining, and legislative relief is likely to be sought, it is interesting to speculate over whose interests are likely to prevail. The Convention survey asked:

When it comes to influencing state legislation affecting education, which three of the following would you identify as having the most influence?

The results are reported in Table XIII.

State teacher organizations are most frequently recognized (88%) as one of three organizations that most influence educational legislation. More than three-fifths of respondents (61%) cite the state school boards association. Slightly more than one-third (36%) cite the state board of education.

Similarly, to assess the influence of political actors at the national level, the Convention study asked:

When it comes influencing national legislation affecting education, which three of the following would you identify as having the most influence?

The results are reported in Table XIV.

The national pattern is similar to that at the state level. Most respondents (87%) list national teacher

Table XIV*Educational influence at the national level*

	%
National Teacher Organization	87
United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare	57
National School Boards Association	50
Federal Courts	46
United States Commissioner of Education	17
National Administrator Associations	12
National PTA	10
Other	2

The total number of respondents for this question is 1632.

Table XV

Perceived state influence in rank-order

				Position in District		Bargaining Law			Region				Type of District				Only Those Who Bargain		
	TOTAL	Male	Female	Board Member	Administrator	Bargaining Law Before 1970	Bargaining Law After 1970	No Law	East	Mid-west	South	West	Rural	Small Town	Sub-urban	Urban	Chief Negotiator	Member of Negotiating Team	Board Member or Superintendent but Not a Member of the Team
State Teacher Organization	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
State School Boards Association	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
State Board of Education	3	3	3	3	6	4	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	4	5	3	3	3
State and Federal Courts	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	5	3	5	5	4	4	3	4	4	4	4
State Superintendent of Education	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	4	5	5	5	3	5	5	5
State Administrators Association	6	6	6	6	3	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
State PTA	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
Other	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8

The total number of respondents for this question is 1584.

Table XVI

Perceived national influence in rank-order

				Position in District		Bargaining Law			Region				Type of District				Only Those Who Bargain			
	TOTAL	Male	Female	Board Mem-ber	Adminis-trator	Bargaining Law Before 1970	Bargaining Law After 1970	No Law	East	Mid-west	South	West	Rural	Small Town	Sub-urban	Ur-ban	Chief Negotiator	Member of Negotiating Team	Board Member or Superintendent but Not a Member of the Team	
National Teacher Organization	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	
National School Boards Association	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	2	3	4	4	4	2	3	
Federal Courts	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	
United States Commissioner of Education	5	5	5	5	6	5	5	5	5	5	6	5	6	5	5	5	5	5	5	
National Administrators Association	6	6	7	6	5	6	6	5	6	6	7	6	5	6	7	6	6	6	6	
National PTA	7	7	6	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	5	7	7	7	6	7	7	7	7	
Other	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	

The total number of respondents for this question is 1584.

Table XVII*School district's primary management concerns*

	%
Collective Bargaining	43
Curriculum Reform	26
Declining Enrollment	25
Public Apathy	24
Cutting Programs to Balance Budgets	24
Cutting Staff to Balance Budgets	21
Discipline	20
Coping with Accountability	18
Steady or Declining Tax Base	18
Outmoded Facilities	16
Teacher Militancy	11
Federal Interference	10
New Legal Rights of Students	6
Drug Abuse	4
Desegregation	3
Racial Tension	1
Other	11

The total number of respondents for this question is 1584.

organizations as one of the three actors which has primary influence. More than half (57%) list the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Half list The National School Boards Association.

Administrator organizations do not fare as well, cited by 17% at the state level and 12% at the national level. Similarly, PTA is cited by 9% at the state and 10% at the national level.

Further analysis of this data by categories of respondent shows that few substantial differences exist. Responses, analyzed by rank order, are shown in Tables XV and XVI.

State teacher organizations and state school boards associations rank in positions one and two for all categories of respondents. Administrators and urban respondents are less convinced of the influence of the state board of education than all other categories.

Most respondents list national teacher organizations and the U.S. Department of Health, Educa-

tion and Welfare as having the most influence; rural board members and members of negotiating teams believe that NSBA ranks second.

What are the primary management concerns of school managers?

Within the past decade, several changes have occurred in American public schools which have had a profound impact upon school managers and school management. Among these are declining enrollments, steady or declining tax base, teacher militancy, desegregation, coping with accountability, and new legal rights of students. Obviously, this list is not exhaustive but these examples reflect the multiplicity of concerns currently confronting school managers.

Since school managers, particularly superintendents and school board members, are experiencing a myriad of problems and concerns, the study asked which of these seem to be the most serious in school districts. Where, in the list of problems, does collective bargaining rank?

Table XVIII

Management concerns by rank-order

	Position in District					Bargaining Law			Region				Type of District				Only Those Who Bargain		
	TOTAL	Male	Female	Board Member	Administrator	Bargaining Law Before 1970	Bargaining Law After 1970	No Law	East	Mid-west	South	West	Rural	Small Town	Sub-urban	Urban	Chief Negotiator	Member of Negotiating Team	Board Member or Superintendent but Not a Member of the Team
Collective Bargaining	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	12	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1
Curriculum Reform	2	2	4	2	2	5	3	1	6	3	1	2	2	2	5	7	4	2	4
Declining Enrollment	3	4	2	2	4	8	2	4	4	2	6	4	7	8	2	1	7	6	3
Public Apathy	4	3	6	4	5	4	5	2	7	4	2	2	3	3	6	8	2	3	6
Cutting Programs to Balance Budgets	5	5	2	5	3	2	4	8	2	5	9	6	5	5	3	3	6	4	2
Cutting Staff to Balance Budgets	6	7	5	6	5	3	6	6	3	6	10	9	10	6	3	4	3	7	5
Discipline	7	6	9	7	10	6	10	5	9	7	3	5	6	4	9	5	9	9	7
Coping with Accountability	8	8	8	9	7	9	7	7	8	10	4	7	8	9	8	10	7	10	8
Steady or Declining Tax Base	9	10	7	8	12	6	9	9	5	9	8	8	9	10	7	8	12	5	9
Outmoded Facilities	10	9	10	10	9	10	8	11	10	8	7	9	4	6	12	11	4	8	10
Teacher Militancy	12	11	12	12	8	11	11	13	11	11	15	12	12	11	10	13	9	11	11
Federal Interference	13	12	13	13	11	14	13	10	13	13	5	13	11	12	13	14	11	13	13
New Legal Rights of Students	14	14	14	14	13	13	14	15	15	14	13	14	14	14	14	15	13	14	14
Drug Abuse	15	15	16	15	16	16	15	14	15	15	14	15	15	15	14	16	14	15	16
Desegregation	16	16	15	16	15	15	16	16	13	16	16	16	17	17	16	6	16	16	15
Racial Tension	17	17	16	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	16	16	17	17	17	16	17	17
Other	11	13	11	11	14	12	12	12	12	12	11	11	13	13	11	12	14	12	12

The total number of respondents for this question is 1584.

Respondents were asked the following question:

From the following list, please check the three most pressing management concerns in your school district.

The items as well as the results are reported in percentages and by rank-order in Table XVII. This information is based upon data for the total sample.

Clearly, collective bargaining is the primary management concern among school districts. Almost half of respondents (43%) list this as one of their most pressing concerns. A little more than one-fourth (26%) of respondents cite curriculum reform as a primary management concern. One-fourth of respondents believe that declining enrollment is a primary concern. Both public apathy and cutting programs to balance budgets are cited by one-fourth (24%) of respondents. One-fifth (21%) say that cutting staffs to balance budgets is a primary concern. One-fifth (20%) say discipline is a major concern. Racial tension and desegregation receive the fewest number of responses.

Analysis of the data by categories of respondent shows some differences in the rank order of management concerns, as shown in Table XVIII.

In the South, where there is little collective bargaining, only 11% of respondents cite bargaining as among the three most pressing problems; in that region, it ranks twelfth. In urban districts, bargaining ranks second to declining enrollment.

Between 20% and 30% of respondents in each

category cite "curriculum reform" and that item ranks second or third in most categories.

Men and women, boards and administrators generally have the same view. Administrators are more likely to cite federal interference, teacher militancy, and new legal rights of students—items which are more likely to affect their activities.

Districts in areas with collective bargaining laws before 1970 and those with laws after 1970 cite bargaining in 49% and 53% of instances, respectively. In districts without bargaining laws, bargaining is cited by 25%, and ranks third.

Regionally, there are substantial differences. The top five items in the East all have financial implication: bargaining, cutting programs to balance budgets, cutting staffs to balance budgets, declining enrollments and steady or declining tax base. In the Midwest, three of these are in the top five: bargaining, declining enrollments, and cutting program to balance budgets. In the West, two of these are in the top five: bargaining and declining enrollments. In the South, none of these are in the top five: respondents from the South perceive their major concerns as curriculum reform, public apathy, discipline, coping with accountability, and federal interference.

Curriculum reform ranks higher among rural and small town responses than in urban or suburban responses. Finance items rank higher among suburban and urban districts than among rural and small town districts.

FOOTNOTES

1. See Appendix A for the Questionnaire; Appendix B for the Research Methodology; and Appendix C for the Sample Composition.
2. *Impact of Collective Bargaining on Curriculum-Instruction*, NSBA Research Report 1975-2. Research conducted and reported for NSBA by: A. Gray Thompson and Russell H. Ziemer. (Washington, D.C.: National School Boards Association, 1975).
3. *AASA Model Public Employee Collective Bargaining Law*. (Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators, 1976).
4. Frank Masters. "Teacher Job Security Under Collective Bargaining Contracts." *Phi Delta Kappan*, (March 1975), p. 458.
5. Emery Stoops, Max Rafferty and Russell Johnson. *Handbook of Educational Administration: A Guide for the Practitioner*. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1975), p. 715.
6. "The Unique Position of the Superintendent of Schools." *School Administrators View Professional Negotiation*. (Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators, 1966).
7. "Superintendent's Role in Negotiations." Educational Policies Service/National School Boards Association.
8. Larry Lundberg. "Preparing for Negotiations." Paper presented at the Annual Convention of The National School Boards Association, San Francisco, April 11-14, 1976.
9. William P. Smith. "Fourteen Reasons for Keeping Superintendents Away from the Table." *Illinois School Board Journal*, (November-December 1975), pp. 30-31.
10. Robert L. Eastman. "The Emerging Position of Chief Negotiator in Public School Superintendency." *ASBSD Bulletin* (Associated School Boards of South Dakota Bulletin).
11. "The Brewing and Perhaps Still Preventable Revolt of School Principals." *The American School Board Journal*, (January 1976), pp. 25-27.
12. Clifford Edwards and Keith Burnett. "The Principal's Role in Negotiations." *Contemporary Education*, (May 1970), pp. 311-313.
13. John Leddy. "Public Participation in Negotiations." *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin*, (September 1975).
14. Phillip G. Jones. "Should the Public Join You and Your Teachers at the Bargaining Table?" *The American School Board Journal*, (September 1975), p. 27.
15. Lawrence Pierce. "Teacher's Organizations and Bargaining: Power Imbalance in the Public Sphere," as cited in National Committee for Citizens in Education, *Public Testimony on Public Schools*. (Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Company).
16. Don Davies. "The People Want a Seat at the Bargaining Table." *Compact*, (February 1975), p. 6.
17. Donald R. Magruder. "The Influence of 'Goldfish Bowl' Bargaining in Education." (Washington, D.C.: Association of Educational Negotiations, 1976).
18. Gregg Downey and Carolyn Mullins. "Where School Boards Do Everything, Even Bargaining in Public View." *The American School Board Journal*, (September 1976), p. 33.
19. Downey and Mullins, *ibid*.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Questionnaire



1976 CONVENTION SURVEY

#1

Dear 1976 NSBA Convention Attendee:

Please take a few minutes to share with us some of your experiences and ideas. Each year, through surveys such as this, NSBA attempts to learn more about the operations of school boards, so that we can better understand and serve. *Please be candid. This questionnaire is anonymous.*

Please return your completed questionnaire to a Convention Staff person as you leave this Clinic session. If this is not possible, please return your questionnaire to the NSBA Information Booth in the registration area. Thank you.

James A. Mecklenburger
NSBA Director of Research

1. How many students in your school district? _____
2. In which state is your school district located? _____
3. Would you describe your school district as predominantly (check *one*):
(1) _____ Rural (3) _____ Suburban
(2) _____ Small town (4) _____ Urban
4. What is your position in your school district?
(1) _____ School Board Member (3) _____ Other (Explain: _____)
(2) _____ Superintendent of Schools
5. How many years have you held this position?
(1) _____ Less than 3 years (3) _____ 8 years or more
(2) _____ 3-7 years
6. Are you: (1) _____ Male (2) _____ Female
- 6b. Are you: (1) _____ Elected (2) _____ Appointed
7. BOARD MEMBERS ONLY: What is your current occupation? _____
What is your current job title? _____
Are you self-employed? (1) _____ Yes (2) _____ No
8. From the following list, please check the *three* most pressing management concerns in your school district:
(1) _____ Drug abuse (10) _____ Public apathy
(2) _____ Curriculum reform (11) _____ Collective bargaining with teachers
(3) _____ Outmoded facilities (12) _____ Federal interference
(4) _____ Declining enrollments (13) _____ Racial tension
(5) _____ Steady or declining tax base (14) _____ New legal rights of students
(6) _____ Teacher militancy (15) _____ Coping with "accountability"
(7) _____ Discipline (16) _____ Cutting programs to balance budget
(8) _____ Desegregation (17) _____ Other (Explain: _____)
(9) _____ Cutting staff to balance budget
9. In this current school year, what is the beginning teacher's salary in your district? _____
10. Does your school district periodically negotiate a contract with a teacher union or organization?
(1) _____ Yes (Please proceed to questions 10a-10f.)
(2) _____ No (Please proceed to question 11.)

10a. During the last time your district negotiated a contract with teachers, what was your role?

- (1) _____ Chief negotiator
- (2) _____ Member of the negotiating team
- (3) _____ Board member or superintendent, but not a member of the negotiating team
- (4) _____ None of the above

10b. Which of the following items are covered by your district's current contract with teachers?

	Covered	Not Covered	Don't Know
(a) Maximum class size	(1) _____	(2) _____	(3) _____
(b) Teacher evaluation procedure	(1) _____	(2) _____	(3) _____
(c) Teacher role in disciplining students	(1) _____	(2) _____	(3) _____
(d) Teacher selection procedures	(1) _____	(2) _____	(3) _____
(e) Teacher promotion procedures	(1) _____	(2) _____	(3) _____
(f) Teacher transfer procedures	(1) _____	(2) _____	(3) _____
(g) Union dues deduction from salary	(1) _____	(2) _____	(3) _____
(h) Textbook selection procedures	(1) _____	(2) _____	(3) _____
(i) Assignment of teacher aides	(1) _____	(2) _____	(3) _____
(j) Curriculum planning procedures	(1) _____	(2) _____	(3) _____
(k) Maximum teacher work load	(1) _____	(2) _____	(3) _____

10c. During the last time your district negotiated a contract with teachers, who served on your district's negotiating team? Please check all appropriate persons in column 1. Who served as your district's chief negotiator? Please check that one person in column 2.

	Members of Negotiating Team	Chief Negotiator
(a) Board president	(1) _____	(2) _____
(b) Board members	(1) _____ (How many? _____)	(2) _____
(c) Superintendent	(1) _____	(2) _____
(d) Professional negotiator retained for this purpose	(1) _____	(2) _____
(e) The regular school district attorney	(1) _____	(2) _____
(f) An attorney retained for this purpose	(1) _____	(2) _____
(g) Central office administrators other than the superintendent	(1) _____ (How many? _____)	(2) _____
(h) Principals	(1) _____ (How many? _____)	(2) _____
(i) Other (Explain: _____)	(1) _____ (How many? _____)	(2) _____

10d. How many years does your current contract cover?

- (1) _____ 1 year
- (2) _____ 2 years
- (3) _____ 3 years
- (4) _____ Other (Explain: _____)

10e. The last time your district negotiated a contract with teachers, how many *months* elapsed from the start of negotiations until the signing of the contract? _____

10f. Boards and teachers sometimes reach an impasse during negotiations. The last time your district negotiated a contract, which of the following experiences did your district have? Check all appropriate items.

- (1) _____ We did not reach an impasse
- (2) _____ Mediation
- (3) _____ Fact-finding
- (4) _____ Advisory arbitration
- (5) _____ Binding arbitration
- (6) _____ Strike
- (7) _____ Other (Explain: _____)

11. Today, some form of collective bargaining negotiations with teachers occurs in the majority of school districts. In your judgment, will collective bargaining become standard practice within all school districts in the nation?

- (1) _____ Yes, in less than 2 years
- (2) _____ Yes, within 2-5 years
- (3) _____ Yes, within 5-10 years
- (4) _____ Yes, but in more than 10 years
- (5) _____ No, some districts will never engage in bargaining with teachers

12. Think about the next few years. What impact will collective bargaining have on your district (if you think bargaining will be happening there), or on other districts?

	I Agree	I Tend To Agree	I Tend To Disagree	I Disagree
(a) Collective bargaining will encourage allocation of funds to those services which most benefit children.	(1) _____	(2) _____	(3) _____	(4) _____
(b) Collective bargaining will result in a better standard of living for teachers.	(1) _____	(2) _____	(3) _____	(4) _____
(c) Collective bargaining will result in better public understanding of school district operation.	(1) _____	(2) _____	(3) _____	(4) _____
(d) Collective bargaining will cause boards and teachers to decide matters (such as teacher promotion) which traditionally have been decided by administrators.	(1) _____	(2) _____	(3) _____	(4) _____
(e) Collective bargaining will force school districts to adopt more effective management and budgeting practices.	(1) _____	(2) _____	(3) _____	(4) _____
(f) Collective bargaining will prompt growth of citizen groups who "lobby" both the board and teacher organizations for the benefit of children.	(1) _____	(2) _____	(3) _____	(4) _____
(g) Collective bargaining will cause board members to be better informed about school district operations.	(1) _____	(2) _____	(3) _____	(4) _____
(h) Collective bargaining will cause reduction in the decision-making authority of school boards.	(1) _____	(2) _____	(3) _____	(4) _____
(i) Collective bargaining will tend to diminish the authority of school administrators over school affairs.	(1) _____	(2) _____	(3) _____	(4) _____
(j) Collective bargaining will increase the local tax burden on citizens.	(1) _____	(2) _____	(3) _____	(4) _____
(k) Collective bargaining will cause school boards to take a more aggressive role in planning, goal setting, priority setting, and the like.	(1) _____	(2) _____	(3) _____	(4) _____
(l) Collective bargaining will prompt teacher organizations to be more responsive to the public's wishes.	(1) _____	(2) _____	(3) _____	(4) _____
(m) Collective bargaining by each school district will be replaced by bargaining at the regional or state level.	(1) _____	(2) _____	(3) _____	(4) _____
(n) Collective bargaining will make teacher strikes more frequent than if there were no bargaining at all.	(1) _____	(2) _____	(3) _____	(4) _____
(o) Collective bargaining will force a disproportionate share of school funds into salaries and benefits.	(1) _____	(2) _____	(3) _____	(4) _____

13. What services do you believe your district might purchase for a reasonable fee from school boards associations in order to enable your board or administrative staff to deal with collective bargaining more effectively? (Check all appropriate items.)

- (1) _____ More training in the bargaining process
- (2) _____ Negotiators employed by the association
- (3) _____ Consultation during negotiations about proposed contract language
- (4) _____ Up-to-date statewide salary and benefits data
- (5) _____ Up-to-date national salary and benefits data
- (6) _____ Other (Explain: _____)

14. In your judgment, what should be the role of the superintendent during collective bargaining? (Check all that apply.)

- (1) _____ The superintendent should not be involved in the process.
- (2) _____ The superintendent should be neutral, an information resource to both sides, supporting neither.
- (3) _____ The superintendent should support and advise the board, but not sit at the table.
- (4) _____ The superintendent should sit at the table as a member of the board's negotiating team.
- (5) _____ The superintendent should be the board's chief negotiator.
- (6) _____ What other role do you regard as appropriate for a superintendent? _____

15. In your judgment, what should be the role of a school principal during collective bargaining? Check all that apply.)
- (1) _____ A principal should not be involved in the process.
 - (2) _____ A principal should be neutral, an information resource to both sides, supporting neither.
 - (3) _____ A principal should support and advise the board, but not sit at the table.
 - (4) _____ A principal should support and advise teachers on their bargaining position.
 - (5) _____ A principal should be a member of the board's negotiating team.
 - (6) _____ A principal should be a member of the teachers' negotiating team.
 - (7) _____ What other role do you regard as appropriate for a principal? _____
16. In what ways, if any, do you think the public should be involved in the collective bargaining process? (Check all appropriate items.)
- (1) _____ No involvement; the board is the public's representative.
 - (2) _____ The board should hold hearings in advance of the bargaining process.
 - (3) _____ Negotiation sessions should be open to press and public scrutiny.
 - (4) _____ Representatives of citizen groups should be a third party at the table.
 - (5) _____ The final agreement should be subject to a public referendum.
 - (6) _____ Other (Explain: _____)
17. Suppose that a collective bargaining law were being written or rewritten in your state today, and you (personally) had the opportunity to assure *one* provision of that law. Please check which *one* of the following would be your highest priority in a bargaining law:
- (1) _____ Limiting the scope of bargaining to finance items (e.g. wages, hours)
 - (2) _____ Establishing a broad scope of items that are subject to bargaining
 - (3) _____ Outlawing the right of teachers to strike
 - (4) _____ Affirming the right of teachers to strike
 - (5) _____ Compulsory arbitration, instead of a strike
 - (6) _____ Other (Explain: _____)
18. When it comes to influencing *state* legislation affecting education, which *three* of the following would you identify as having the most influence?
- (1) _____ State teacher organizations
 - (2) _____ State school boards association
 - (3) _____ State PTA
 - (4) _____ State administrator associations
 - (5) _____ State and federal courts
 - (6) _____ State Superintendent of Education
 - (7) _____ State Board of Education
 - (8) _____ Other (Explain: _____)
19. When it comes to influencing *national* legislation affecting education, which *three* of the following would you identify as having the most influence?
- (1) _____ National teacher organizations
 - (2) _____ National School Boards Association
 - (3) _____ National PTA
 - (4) _____ National administrator associations
 - (5) _____ Federal courts
 - (6) _____ U.S. Commissioner of Education
 - (7) _____ U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare
 - (8) _____ Other (Explain: _____)

APPENDIX B

Research Methodology

The questionnaire was revised several times and field tested at meetings of board members and administrators in Phoenix and Chicago before the final version was administered.

Utilizing the information gathered from these two field testings, the final version of the questionnaire was reduced to four pages, as can be seen in Appendix A.

Respondents are school board members and administrators in attendance at certain predetermined clinics at the Annual Convention of the National School Boards Association, San Francisco, April 11-14, 1976. The clinics where the questionnaire was administered were selected because of: (1) projected attendance as based upon the topic of discussion, (2) geographical regions likely to be represented in the audience due to the nature of the topic and (3) type of school districts likely to be represented in the audience due to the nature of the topic. To minimize bias in responses, the questionnaire was not administered at any session where collective bargaining was the topic for discussion.

All subjects volunteered for this investigation. They were encouraged not to discuss their answers among each other. At the beginning of the session, subjects were told the purpose for the research project, and complete anonymity of responses was guaranteed.

The data were analyzed by using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

APPENDIX C

Sample Composition

	Number	Percent
All respondents	1632	100
Sex		
Male	1269	78
Female	353	22
No response	10	0
Position		
Board Member	1387	85
Central Office Administrator	242	15
No response	3	0
Years in position		
Less than 3 years	657	40
3 - 7 years	626	38
8 years or more	344	21
No response	5	0
Type of board member		
Elected	1229	89
Appointed	70	5
No response	88	6
Type of school district		
Rural	446	27
Small town	484	30
Suburban	542	33
Urban	142	9
No response	18	1
Beginning Salary		
\$10,000 and more	153	9
\$ 9,000 - 9,999	441	27
\$ 8,000 - 8,999	752	46
\$ 7,000 - 7,999	173	11
\$ 6,999 and less	22	1
No response	91	6
Size of school district		
25,000 or more	97	6
10,000 - 24,999	196	12
5,000 - 9,999	312	19
2,500 - 4,999	379	23
1,000 - 2,499	427	26
600 - 999	114	7
300 - 599	76	5
299 and less	24	2
No response	7	0
Region		
East: Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Vermont, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia	356	24
Midwest: Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, Kansas, Nebraska, Missouri	678	42

	Number	Percent
South: Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Texas, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Louisiana	244	15
West: Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Nevada, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Utah, California, Washington, Oregon, Alaska, Hawaii	344	21
No response	10	0
Status of a collective bargaining law		
Before 1970	394	24
After 1970	710	44
No Law	521	32
No response	7	0

	Number	Adjusted Frequency Percent
Occupation of school board members		
Technical and managerial	215	16
Housewife	173	13
Farmer, rancher	144	11
Business proprietor, banker	135	10
Sales and marketing	102	8
Education	100	8
Engineer, designer, architect, contractor	86	6
Government	65	5
Physician	47	4
Retired	42	3
Accountant	31	2
Dentist	28	2
Laborer (semi-skilled)	28	2
Lawyer	25	2
Clerical	24	2
Public relations and advertising	21	2
Scientist	20	2
Corporate executive	17	1
Director	10	1
Minister	7	1
Association, union & non-profit organization	7	1
Student	2	0

Distribution of respondents by states

	Number	Percent
1. ALABAMA	4	.2
2. ALASKA	12	.7
3. ARIZONA	27	1.7
4. ARKANSAS	6	.4
5. CALIFORNIA	91	5.6
6. COLORADO	46	2.8
7. CONNECTICUT	6	.4
8. DELAWARE	4	.2
9. FLORIDA	7	.4

Distribution of respondents by states

	Number	Percent
10. GEORGIA	8	.5
11. HAWAII	0	0
12. IDAHO	23	1.4
13. ILLINOIS	119	7.3
14. INDIANA	78	4.8
15. IOWA	85	5.2
16. KANSAS	62	3.8
17. KENTUCKY	29	1.8
18. LOUISIANA	15	.9
19. MAINE	11	.7
20. MARYLAND	6	.4
21. MASSACHUSETTS	18	1.1
22. MICHIGAN	94	5.8
23. MINNESOTA	69	4.2
24. MISSISSIPPI	6	.4
25. MISSOURI	21	1.3
26. MONTANA	18	1.1
27. NEBRASKA	38	2.3
28. NEVADA	13	.8
29. NEW HAMPSHIRE	2	.1
30. NEW JERSEY	28	1.7
31. NEW MEXICO	4	.2
32. NEW YORK	98	6.0
33. NORTH CAROLINA	25	1.5
34. NORTH DAKOTA	3	.2
35. OHIO	57	3.5
36. OKLAHOMA	21	1.3
37. OREGON	44	2.7
38. PENNSYLVANIA	171	10.5
39. RHODE ISLAND	7	.4
40. SOUTH CAROLINA	26	1.6
41. SOUTH DAKOTA	7	.4
42. TENNESSEE	0	0
43. TEXAS	15	.9
44. UTAH	69	4.2
45. VERMONT	21	1.3
46. VIRGINIA	11	.7
47. WASHINGTON	44	2.7
48. WEST VIRGINIA	2	.1
49. WISCONSIN	43	2.6
50. WYOMING	8	.5
51. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	1	.1